

CONCURRENCE WITH P. J. P. WHITEHEAD IN PROPOSAL TO SUPPRESS
ATHERINA JAPONICA HOUTTUYN, 1782 AS A *NOMEN DUBIUM*.
 Z.N.(S.) 569

By Carl L. Hubbs (*University of California, San Diego, La Jolla*)

The subject proposal by P. J. P. Whitehead (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 20, pt. 4, July, 1963 : 281-284) states the case clearly and conclusively. An Opinion implementing the three stated propositions would adequately amplify Opinion 93 and would contribute to stability in the nomenclature of certain widely known fishes.

Two minor points in the proposal, though not affecting the three propositions to be voted on, are sufficiently confusing to warrant comment.

The first point is the assertion that *Anchoviella* Fowler, 1911 is a synonym of *Stolephorus* Lacépède "if restricted solely to Indo-Pacific species (as in Fowler, 1941, *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* No. 100 : 696)." Fowler did not so restrict *Anchoviella* in the paper cited; he included American species (listed as type species of generic synonyms) and, in Whitehead's opinion (and mine), misplaced the Indo-Pacific species in a strictly American genus: Jordan, in drafting Opinion 93, likewise confused the Indo-Pacific species that are commonly referred to *Stolephorus* with *Anchoviella*. Furthermore, such subjective generic synonymies should not be stated in a way that might be construed as a fact.

The second point involves the recommendation that a clarifying phrase ("if such be assumed") be inserted in proposition (3), to read:

(3) place the following names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, each having validity notwithstanding the apparent priority, if such be assumed, of *Atherina japonica* Houttuyn, 1782:

Both of these points emphasize the contrast between the application of the Code and the systematic judgment of each zoologist.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS IN
 CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN NAMES OF TANAGER. Z.N.(S.) 1182
 (see volume 20, pages 296-302)

By Alexander Wetmore (*Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

As introduction to the brief comments that follow, may I repeat a part of what Dr. Mayr has stated in section II of his memorandum; namely, that action by Miller and Wetmore in 1926 in the use of *Thraupis* and Thraupidae was in accord with rules and procedures current at that time. These names, and usage in the others concerned in the present discussion, were accepted—again as Dr. Mayr has stated—and are found in major check-lists and other important reference works in ornithology throughout the Americas. There is thus no confusion regarding them among the considerable number of workers resident in the vast region where these interesting birds are found.

Whenever ornithologists abroad have need to consider this American family in any way the current names are readily available.

It seems unrealistic to consider change at this time to avoid "confusion" among the last mentioned group, as any such action certainly would confuse and disturb the far greater body of workers in the New World who deal with these birds. In addition there would arise difficulties in connection with the considerable volume of modern literature in which these current names appear.

Dr. Kenneth C. Parkes has discussed these matters with me, and I agree with his findings in the thoughtfully worded summary that he has submitted.

It is my opinion that adoption of any of the changes suggested would be unwise. It is my recommendation that all be denied.

By Robert W. Storer (*Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan,
 Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*)

Dr. Kenneth C. Parkes has sent me a copy of his carefully documented comments on the proposed changes in the names of certain tanagers.